UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/963,335	09/24/2001	Kenneth A. Klarfeld	MET2.PAU.23	2141
	7590 08/07/200 ES ANDRAS & SHER		EXAMINER	
19900 MACARTHUR BLVD.			BROWN, RUEBEN M	
SUITE 1150 IRVINE, CA 92	2612		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2623	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/07/2008	PAPER

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/963,335	KLARFELD ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	REUBEN M. BROWN	2623
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING I - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perior Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statu. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mail earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION  1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tired will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
1)☑ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 2a)☐ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)☑ Th 3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice under	is action is non-final. ance except for formal matters, pro	
Disposition of Claims		
4) ☐ Claim(s) 20-32 is/are pending in the applicati  4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdr  5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed.  6) ☐ Claim(s) 20-32 is/are rejected.  7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to.  8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/  Application Papers  9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examir	rawn from consideration.  /or election requirement.	
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) according a control and applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct should be correctly as a control and the correct should be control and t	ccepted or b) objected to by the e drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Section is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bure * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. nts have been received in Applicat iority documents have been receive au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Stage
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5/22/08.	4)  Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5)  Notice of Informal F 6)  Other:	ate

Application/Control Number: 09/963,335 Page 2

Art Unit: 2623

**DETAILED ACTION** 

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in

37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is

eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e)

has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to

37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 5/22/08 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims have been considered but are not

persuasive. Applicant argues on page 9, that in the present invention, "it is clear that according to

Herz only one set of recommended programs is presented". Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Herz (col. 26, lines 45-67 thru col. 27, lines 1-5) discloses an embodiment in which the

agreement matrix is recalculated based on which program(s) the customer did or did not watch

that were recommended for viewing. After the agreement matrix is updated, then a new list of

recommended programs are presented to the viewer, which reads on the claimed 'second list

including alternative TV programs available for viewing'.

Application/Control Number: 09/963,335 Page 3

Art Unit: 2623

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on

sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 20-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Herz, (U.S. Pat

# 5,758,257).

Considering claims 20 & 28, the claimed method of displaying a TV program to a

viewer, comprising 'processing information indicative of preferences of the viewer to develop a

viewer characteristic information profile for the viewer' is met by Herz, col. 10, lines 6-55; col.

11, lines 15-65 thru col. 12, lines 1-55; col. 14, lines 10-65, col. 15, lines 10-60.

'Storing the viewer characteristics information profile on a viewer storage device', is met

by col. 40, lines 21-65; col. 41, lines 1-15; col. 45, lines 9-30. 'Presenting the viewer with a first

list of TV programs available for viewing, the programs selected in accordance with the

characteristics information profile', is met by Herz, col. 23, lines 1-18 & col. 25, lines 49-67,

which teaches virtual channels of recommended programs based on the instant customer's

profile.

Page 4

The amended claimed feature of 'receiving feedback input from the viewer after viewing the first list, the input requesting different selections than in the first list'; and 'presenting the viewer with a second list including alternative TV programs for viewing, the alternative list selected in accordance with an alternative characteristics information profile', is met by the disclosure in Herz that the system determines if the customer actually watched the video programs that were recommended by the agreement matrix, col. 26, lines 51-62, for the purpose of adjusting the agreement matrix of a particular customer.

If the customer did not select/watch the predicted program(s), then the system adjusts the customer's profile, based on what was actually watched. Therefore the disclosure of Herz, reads on the claimed subject matter, since after the agreement matrix is updated, then the customer would be given a different list of recommended programs, in light of what was actually requested by the customer, see col. 27, lines 1-6.

Considering claim 21, the claimed subject matter is met by Herz, col. 29, lines 1-26.

Considering claim 22, the claimed subject matter is met by Herz, col. 26, lines 21-50, which teaches that a plurality of profiles for different viewer may be stored at the STB.

Considering claims 23-27, Herz meets all subject matter, col. 17, lines 35-65; col. 23, lines 1-15; col. 26, lines 5-65; col. 46, lines 1-20.

Art Unit: 2623

Considering claims 29-31, see Herz, col. 26, lines 1-21; col. 29, lines 1-25; col. 29, lines 30-65 & col 45, lines 20-65; col. 49, lines 1-10.

Considering claim 32, the claimed method for prestige TV programs to a viewer, comprises steps that correspond with subject matter mentioned above in the rejection of claim 20, and is likewise treated. As for the additional feature, of the 'first list arranged without viewer input', in Herz the arrangement of the virtual lists are without user input, col. 45, lines 35-45.

## Conclusion

- 4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
- A) Graves Teaches updating user profile based on feedback or evaluation; see col. 7-col. 9 & Fig. 2.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner for Patents

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

or faxed to:

(571) 273-8300, (for formal communications intended for entry)

(571) 273-7290 (for informal or draft communications, please label

Page 6

"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should

be directed to Reuben M. Brown whose telephone number is (571) 272-7290. The examiner can normally

be reached on M-F(8:30-6:00), First Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor,

Christopher Kelley can be reached on (571) 272-7331. The fax phone numbers for the organization

where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300 for regular communications and After

Final communications.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application

Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained

from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available

through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-

direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Reuben M. Brown/

Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2623